

## **REMARKS**

The following Remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action issued on November 15, 2006 in connection with the above-identified patent application.

Claims 1-7, 9-21, and 23-28 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims and have been amended. No claims have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the application and no new issues have been raised by the amendments. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the Specification at Paragraphs [0040] and [0043], for example.

Claims 1-7, 9-21, and 23-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0199867 (“Brandenburg”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

To anticipate, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim in the above-identified patent application and such a teaching must be as complete in detail as the claim in the above-identified patent application. MPEP § 2131. Brandenburg does not teach “the transforming process ... receiving a selection of a piece of edited content, the content including a plurality of items” as recited in claims 1 and 15. As recited by the Examiner, “Brandenburg discloses Publishing Content Objects (PCCs), which are created and managed in the content management system.” (Office Action ¶ 6; Page 3, [0034]). The content management system that is based on one or several databases includes publication contents as Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) stored therein. (Page 1, [0008]-[0009]). The Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) include associated metadata fields describing the objects like purpose, origination, state, type, deadline, etc. *Id.* Merely disclosing Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) with metadata does not teach “the transforming process ... receiving a selection of a piece of edited content, the content including a plurality of items” as recited in claims 1 and 15. For example, Applicant submits that the Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) and the metadata corresponding thereto described in Brandenburg is not a piece of edited content received as part of a transforming process as claimed. Instead, Brandenburg discloses a layout budget that may be executed by performing a selection of a subset of metadata based on a grading, or rank, of the metadata and publishing, or displaying, the

Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) associated with the subset of metadata. (Page 2, [0028]; Page 4, [0050]; Page 6, [0112]).

Furthermore, Brandenburg does not teach as complete in detail as necessary to anticipate “the transforming process ... receiving a selection of a piece of edited content, the content including a plurality of items” as recited in claims 1 and 15. Merely disclosing Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) with metadata does not contain sufficient detail to anticipate a transforming process that receives a piece of edited content. Accordingly, Brandenburg does not anticipate the claim limitation “the transforming process ... receiving a selection of a piece of edited content, the content including a plurality of items” as recited in claims 1 and 15.

Brandenburg also does not teach “the transforming process ... outputting the page based on the selected content, the selected edit form, the selected content control statement, and the generated layout statement, the page being in a pre-selected rendering format” as recited in claims 1 and 15. As recited by the Examiner, “Brandenburg discloses outputting the metadata and the POC associated with it.” (Office Action ¶ 6). Brandenburg describes that the metadata may be filtered and that the results of that filtering may be displayed on a workstation screen of any desk budget. (Page 6, [0112]). The desk budget includes a tool for each assignment editor in maintaining budgets of stories from his or her desk. (Page 3, [0045]). Brandenburg also describes that the metadata fields may be entered and edited through entry forms or in list windows. (Page 12, [0234]-[0238]). Merely filtering metadata and displaying the results of that filtering on a screen of a desk budget does not teach “the transforming process ... outputting the page based on the selected content, the selected edit form, the selected content control statement, and the generated layout statement, the page being in a pre-selected rendering format.” For example, Applicant submits that the displayed filtered metadata described in Brandenburg is not a transforming process that outputs a page in a pre-selected rendering format as claimed.

Furthermore, Brandenburg does not teach as complete in detail as necessary to anticipate “the transforming process ... outputting the page based on the selected content, the selected edit form, the selected content control statement, and the generated layout statement, the page being in a pre-selected rendering format” as recited in claims 1 and 15. Merely describing the ability to filter metadata and display the results of such a filter on a screen of a

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2755/303265.01  
**Application No.:** 10/721,142  
**Office Action Dated:** November 15, 2006

**PATENT**

desk budget does not contain sufficient detail to anticipate the transforming process outputting a page in a pre-selected format. Accordingly, Brandenburg does not anticipate the claim limitation “the transforming process ... outputting the page based on the selected content, the selected edit form, the selected content control statement, and the generated layout statement, the page being in a pre-selected rendering format” as recited in claims 1 and 15.

Because the cited references do not teach all of the claimed limitations and such teachings are not as complete in detail as the claimed limitations, the rejections cannot stand. Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 1 and 15 and the claims that depend from them is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application including claims 1-7, 9-21, and 23-28 is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Date: February 15, 2007

/Michael P. Dunnam/  
Michael P. Dunnam  
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439